

PHILADELPHIA  
ATLANTA  
CHARLOTTE  
CHERRY HILL  
CHICAGO  
DALLAS  
DENVER  
LAS VEGAS  
LONDON  
LOS ANGELES



RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 23 2004

NEWARK  
NEW YORK  
SAN DIEGO  
SAN FRANCISCO  
SEATTLE  
TRENTON  
WASHINGTON, DC  
WEST CONSHOHOCKEN  
WICHITA  
WILMINGTON

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

1900 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-3508 215.665.2000 800.523.2900 215.665.2013 FAX [www.cozen.com](http://www.cozen.com)

## FACSIMILE

FROM: Brian L. Belles	TIMEKEEPER NO.: 1763
SENDER'S PHONE: 215.665.7244	SENDER'S FAX: 215.701.2044
# OF PAGES (INCLUDING COVER):	FILE NAME: VERTE.076A
DATE: September 23, 2004	FILE #: 149574

RECIPIENT(S)	PHONE	FAX
USPTO - Deposit Account Order		703 308-7048

## MESSAGE:

Serial No. 10/059,682  
MEGASONIC PROBE ENERGY DIRECTOR  
Filing Date: Jan. 29, 2002

Following is transmittal sheet and response to restriction requirement dated August 30, 2004 - total including this cover sheet -- 5 sheets

IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE ALL PAGES, PLEASE CALL 215.665.2000 or 800.523.2900 IMMEDIATELY.

THIS TRANSMISSION IS ALSO BEING SENT VIA:

- Regular Mail
- Certified Mail
- Hand Delivery
- Overnight Mail
- Federal Express
- E-Mail

## NOTICE

The information contained in this transmission is privileged and confidential. It is intended for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended addressee, the reader is hereby notified that any consideration, dissemination or duplication of this communication is strictly prohibited. If the addressee has received this communication in error, please return this transmission to us at the above address by mail. We will reimburse you for postage. In addition, if this communication was received in the U.S., please notify us immediately by phoning and asking for the Fax Center.

PTO/SB/21 (04-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0551-0031

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

**TRANSMITTAL  
FORM**


(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

		Application Number	10/059,682
		Filing Date	Jan. 29, 2002
		First Named Inventor	Mario E. Bran
		Art Unit	1746
		Examiner Name	Andrew McAleavy
Total Number of Pages in This Submission		Attorney Docket Number	VERTE.076A

**ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)**

<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Technology Center (TC)
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached	<input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Reply	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
<input type="checkbox"/> After Final	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application	<input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information
<input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address	<input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter
<input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
<input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund	
<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement	<input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application		
<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53		
Remarks		

**SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT**

Firm or Individual name	Brian L. Belles
Signature	
Date	Sept. 24, 2004

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.

Typed or printed name	Brian L. Belles		
Signature		Date	Sept. 23, 2004

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

*If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.*


**DOCKET NO. VERTE.076A**  
 Serial No. 10/059,682  
 Response to Office Action of 8/30/04

RECEIVED  
 CENTRAL FILE CENTER **PATENT**  
 SEP 23 2004

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Art Unit : 1746  
 Attorney Docket : VERTE.076A  
 Examiner : Andrew McAleavy  
 Serial No. : 10/059,682  
 Filed : January 29, 2002  
 Inventor : Mario E. Bran  
 Title : MEGASONIC PROBE ENERGY DIRECTOR

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being  
 facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office  
 on September 23, 2004

  
 Brian L. Belles, Reg. No. 51,322

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

In response to the Office communication of August 30, 2004, Applicant elects with traverse Invention I, which is drawn to the apparatus and consists of claims 1-20.

Applicants traverse the restriction requirement because the inventions as grouped are not independent and distinct. Specifically, the reasoning set forth in the Office Action for concluding that the inventions are distinct is both flawed and unreasonable. Because "the burden is on the examiner to provide *reasonable* examples that recite material differences" between the inventions *as claimed*, the restriction requirement must be withdrawn. See MPEP § 806.05(e), ¶ 8.17.

According to the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure ("MPEP"), section 802.01, the term "independent" means that there is no disclosed relationship between the two or more subjects disclosed. Stated in simplest terms, "independent" means "not dependent." See MPEP § 802.01 ¶ 3. In the present case there *is* a disclosed relationship between Inventions I and II. The claims of Invention II are directed toward a process while the claims of Invention I are

DOCKET NO. VERTE.076A  
Serial No. 10/059,682  
Response to Office Action of 8/30/04

PATENT

directed toward a system for carrying out the process of Invention II. It is a well established principle that a group of claims directed toward a product and a group of claims directed toward a system for carrying out that process are dependent inventions. In fact, this dependency is explicitly recognized in the MPEP. See MPEP § 802.01 ¶ 6. Thus, Inventions I and II are not independent.

However, according to MPEP § 802.01, dependent inventions may nonetheless be properly divided if they are in fact "distinct." According to MPEP § 806.05(e), "a process and apparatus for its practice can be shown to be distinct inventions, if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be practiced by another *materially* different apparatus or by hand, or (2) that the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another materially different process." See MPEP § 806.05(e) (emphasis added). "The burden is on the examiner to provide reasonable examples that recite material differences." MPEP § 806.05(e), ¶ 8.17.

In accordance with this burden, the Office Action first states that "the product as claimed can be used for a variety of processes other than cleaning, including semiconductor processes, such as etching, and more general processes involving heat and vibration, such as reliability testing." While Applicants agrees with this statement, according to this logic, the method as claimed is also not limited to cleaning. Turning to the language of the claims directed to the apparatus of Invention I, the only mention of the concept of "cleaning" in the claims is in the preamble of the claims, "[a]n assembly for cleaning a thin, flat substrate comprising." See e.g., claim 1. As such the examiner has obviously not given the preamble of the apparatus claims patentable weight. Turning now to the language of the claims directed to the method of Invention II, similarly, the only mention of the concept of "cleaning" in these claims is in the preamble of the claims, "[a] method of cleaning a substrate comprising the steps of." See e.g., claim 1. However, in this instance, and contrary to the examiner's interpretation of the apparatus claims, the examiner has given the preamble patentable weight.

There is no explanation set forth as to why the apparatus and method claims have been interpreted differently. Such inconsistent claim interpretation is improper and not allowable.

DOCKET NO. VERTE.076A  
Serial No. 10/059,682  
Response to Office Action of 8/30/04

PATENT

Surely the claims can not be interpreted differently just so a Restriction Requirement can be issued. Such practice is improper. See MPEP § 806.01 (stating that it "is the claimed subject matter that is considered and such claimed subject matter must be compared in order to determine the question of distinctness or independence").

Thus, the distinctions recognized in the Office Action are improper and do not show that the claimed inventions are distinct. Thus, the burden is now on the Examiner to document another materially different process or apparatus or withdraw the restriction requirement. See MPEP § 806.05(e), ¶ 8.17.

Finally, according to MPEP § 803, "if the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions." See MPEP § 803 (emphasis added). In the present application, Inventions I and II are very closely related. Any search performed for the apparatus will uncover the relevant prior art for the process. In fact, it is likely that the same prior art will be cited against both the process and apparatus claims if a rejection for the claims of the present application issues.

For these reasons, following the instructions of the MPEP, the restriction requirement is improper and should be withdrawn.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 9/23/04



Brian L. Belles  
Reg. No. 51,322  
Cozen O'Connor  
1900 Market Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
(215) 665-7244

BLB/kf